

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/615,114	FERNANDEZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Donald Heckenberg	1722	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Gretchen Hosty (Applicant's Rep.).

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Donald Heckenberg (PTO Exmr.).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 12 December 2005
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
 N/A

Claims discussed:  
 N/A


Prior art documents discussed:  
 N/A

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
 See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 12-2-5  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Exmr. Heckenberg proposed amendment correcting potential new matter problem with language of specification with respect to material valve plug is composed above. Ms. Hosty noted that while not necessarily agreeing with reasoning for amendment, change was acceptable. (see Exmr.'s Amdt.). It was also noted that the amended language is directed to subject matter not recited in the claims. .